DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 170 HE 006 487

TITLE	Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education. Report of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
INSTITUTION	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	36p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Admission (School); Admission Criteria; *Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Employment; Financial Support; *Foreign Students; *Higher Education; *Program Development

ABSTRACT

It is the intent of this report to review the history of the Crucial Issues Project and to summarize the activities of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and individual NAFSA members as they may relate to concerns raised at the Brainerd, Minnesota meeting in October 1970. Although as many as 12 important issues were identified at the Brainerd meeting, several were interrelated and can be summarized under three major headings: orientation, foreign student financing, and institutional policies related to foreign student admissions. The issues raised point to a continuing need for further development, research, and action to deal with such major concerns as foreign student employment and finances, programs of on-going orientation to the U.S. and predeparture orientation, the relevancy of academic programs, and job placement in the home country. (Author/KE)

ED 017170

Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REP-
RESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 487

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs wishes to express gratitude to the following persons who served as the Reading Committee for this manuscript: Mrs. Katherine C. Donovan; Mrs. Johanne Glass, English Language Institute, University of Michigan; and Dr. Josef Mestenhauser, University of Minnesota. The Association also gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, in publishing this report.

Please Order From
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
1860-19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1
Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Crucial Issues
In Foreign Student Education..... 4
Orientation..... 5
Foreign Student Financing..... 5
Institutional Policies Related to
Foreign Student Admissions..... 5
Action By CAFSS Executive Committee..... 6
The Report..... 9
Group I - Institutional Policy..... 9
Findings..... 9
Commentary..... 9
Group II - Departmental Policy.....10
Findings.....10
Commentary.....10
Group III - Admissions.....10
Findings.....10
Commentary.....11
Group IV - Financial Aid.....11
Findings.....11
Commentary.....11
Group V - English.....12
Findings.....12
Commentary.....12
Group VI - Services and Programs.....13
Findings.....13
Commentary.....13
Epilogue to the Report of the Task Force.....14
Crucial Issues Project Expanded.....16
Foreign Student Finances and Employment.....19
Foreign Student Orientation.....23
Pre-Departure Orientation.....23
Home Country Employment.....27
Conclusion and Recommendations.....28
Footnotes.....32

CRUCIAL ISSUES
IN FOREIGN STUDENT EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

It is the intent of this report to review the history of the Crucial Issues Project and to summarize the activities of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and individual NAFSA members as they may relate to the concerns raised at the Brainerd, Minnesota meeting in October 1970. The issues identified by the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education became the basis for considerable activity on the part of NAFSA, which led to a number of major projects. Examples are the Task Force on Crucial Issues' report on the foreign graduate student, the study of foreign student employment and financing, the work of the Legislative Liaison Committee, the Wingspread colloquium on Re-Entry/Transition Seminars and the Home Country Employment Registry. Among the issues deemed "crucial" by the Task Force in 1970, many are still current and remain unresolved.

Recent efforts by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) to deal with issues considered "crucial" in the education of foreign students can be traced back to the mid-sixties when a group of experienced foreign student advisers from universities enrolling more than 400 foreign students came together in an ad hoc meeting to discuss the special needs of larger institutions. Known as Committee X, this group succeeded in focusing attention on the need to develop new approaches in foreign student programming which would serve to broaden the total educational experience of students from abroad. Its activities led to the formation of the Council of Foreign Student Advisers which, in turn became NAFSA's fourth major interest section, the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars (CAFSS). Since CAFSS was to assume a major role in projects to be discussed in this report, it may be useful to refer to the purposes of the section which are found in the CAFSS "Statement of Organization and Procedures":

> "To improve all aspects of programs for foreign students and scholars such as orientation, counseling, records, housing, health services, financial aid, relationships with students, faculty, administration and the community, and liaison with governments and private agencies;
>
> To foster all aspects of international educational exchange, including programs involving foreign students and scholars, through liaison and cooperation with administrators of international programs, international organizations, United States and foreign governments, international committees of professional associations, private agencies, student organizations, and the NAFSA committees and sections;

> To promote the professional development and status of advisers to foreign students and scholars through the study of theories and the practice of techniques of counseling, of human relationships, and of inter-cultural understanding. Further, to develop professional attitudes in its members through the conduct of research studies and the stimulation of individuals to seek professional preparation for their work."

Thus, the work of the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars became the logical breeding ground for the raising of new concerns and the indentification of far-reaching problems which were to become known as "Crucial Issues" in foreign student education.

In June 1969, the Steering Committee of the NAFSA Field Service Program endorsed a resolution adopted by the NAFSA Regional Council which called upon the Association to undertake the following obligations:

> "To provide continuing opportunities for experienced personnel to consider crucial issues in international education and the changing campus scene and to develop new approaches for work with foreign students. Through its Executive Director and Board, NAFSA will continue to seek funds for this purpose in order to make these opportunities available to its members. In addition, it will make Field Service Program funds available, whenever feasible, on a matching basis, or through partial subsidy for workshops or seminars especially planned for experienced personnel whether professional or volunteer."

In the early months of the ensuing year, the staff of the Field Service Program undertook a study of the special nature of foreign student programming at larger institutions and soon recognized the need to identify issues of major concern in foreign student education. When NAFSA was advised that the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs would look with favor on activities of special interest to experienced foreign student advisers and directors of international offices, the Field Service Steering Committee recommended that new projects be encouraged. At its meeting in April 1970, it was announced that the proposed budget of the Field Service Program included an item of $3,000.00 in support of such projects on an experimental basis.

The previous January additional views on matters of concern had been sought when the Field Service Steering Committee had invited a group of national consultants to come together for the purpose of discussing issues related to the education of foreign students. This meeting attracted representatives from the following national organizations: the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the American Council on Education (ACE), the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), Education and World Affairs (EWA), the Institute of International Education (IIE), and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDAC).

At this meeting, the consultants concluded that those involved in international education should devote more attention to the question of whether the education received by foreign students in the U.S., particularly at the graduate level, is relevant to the home country situation. One suggested approach to this question was to concentrate on the experience of foreign students in specific disciplines, especially those in professional schools at major public and private institutions. Reference was made to the EWA report The Professional School and World Affairs published in 1967. Since the professions have developed an international outreach because the functions they serve must be performed in all societies, the education of foreign students can be more realistically examined within the framework of these disciplines. Efforts to "internationalize" the curriculum within the fields of professional education would tend to make them less culturally bound and more beneficial to Americans as well as to foreign students.

In a summary prepared for the Cornell College of Agriculture Review Committee entitled "Program in International Agricultural Development", Kenneth C. Turk, Director of Cornell University's International Agricultural Development Program, made the following observation:

> "Too often it is found that graduate and professional training given foreign students is unrealistic in terms of the conditions they have upon returning to their home country. Their thesis problem in the United States may have no application whatever, the sophisticated equipment they have learned to use may not be available, and in other cases the level of development of science makes other knowledge more necessary than that gained in the United States."[1]

Thus, it is important that the foreign student who studies a profession in the U.S. develop the versatility and ingenuity needed to adapt methods and techniques to the state of the art in his home country.

The EWA report argues that foreign students must be urged as part of their U.S. experience to think in terms of how they can best apply what they have learned to the situation in their home country. The study of sociology, economics and comparative politics should be added to core subjects and made a basic part of curriculum.

> "One of the major problems which the foreign student faces when he returns home is the social system of his country. In many of the developing countries, the centralization of power inhibits the growth of...programs... (and) often the returning practioner is stifled. One of the ways in which U.S. training can contribute to the awakening within the student of ways in which to counteract these factors is to point out the different manner in which many societies operate... The students should learn to analyze hidden power structures, so that they can try to apply with flexibility the basic principles of their profession at home."[2]

The report goes on to advocate pre-departure orientation programs for returning foreign students to prepare them more adequately to cope with reverse culture shock and other reentry problems. Since the returning foreign student may encounter adverse reactions from those who have not studied abroad, he needs to be given the psychological support that can be provided by the advice and counsel of those in his home country who have studied in the U.S. and hold positions of responsibility. The value of pre-departure orientation programs will receive more attention in a later section of this report.

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER CRUCIAL ISSUES IN FOREIGN STUDENT EDUCATION

In order to implement the recommendations of the Regional Council and to explore further some of the many issues which had been raised at the meeting of consultants, the Field Service Steering Committee proposed in April 1970 that key representatives of larger institutions, including experienced personnel, should meet together to identify the issues, to develop workshop plans and to assign responsibility. The Chairman of the Committee was charged with the task of calling such a meeting in cooperation with the Chairman of CAFSS. Funds from the Field Service Program budget for 1970-71 were to provide travel and per diem for the participants.

The meeting proposed in April took place on October 4-5, 1970, in Brainerd, Minnesota, a summer resort area north of Minneapolis. The participants were identified as the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education. The host of the meeting was Dr. Josef A. Mestenhauser of the University of Minnesota, Chairman of CAFSS. Others present included Mr. Homer Higbee of Michigan State University, President of NAFSA and Chairman of the Field Service Steering Committee; Hugh M. Jenkins, Executive Director of NAFSA; Katherine C. Donovan (formerly Bang), Director of the NAFSA Field Service Program; members of the CAFSS Executive Committee; and at least one representative from each of the other three NAFSA Sections. A total of fourteen major public and private institutions were represented on the Committee. The meeting in Brainerd had the following stated purpose:

> "To bring together foreign student advisers and representatives of other Sections to discuss problems in international education, to raise questions of a philosophical nature that demand further attention and to define crucial issues in foreign student education."

After stating the purpose of the meeting, Chairman Higbee called upon the Committee to consider that the foreign student of the 70's is more knowledgeable and generally more sophisticated than his counterpart of ten or 15 years ago. The increasing number of students from abroad who are entering U.S. graduate schools suggest that there needs to be a new approach in the education of foreign students which calls for more direct cooperation between the foreign student adviser (FSA) and academic departments. Rather than viewing the student as a single entity, he should be considered in the context of his involvement in the "developmental process." The committee was challenged to begin raising concerns about the quality of

education received by foreign students and to discuss ways in which all aspects of their learning experience could more effectively be integrated.

Although as many as 12 important issues were identified at the Brainerd meeting, several were inter-related and can be summarized under three major headings:

1. Orientation-- In view of the changing nature of the foreign student, both in character and in type, it would appear that traditional orientation programs may no longer be adequate. Perhaps greater emphasis should be placed on meeting the needs of those within specific disciplines so as to bridge the gap between the level of education in developing countries and the U.S., particularly in professions such as engineering, business administration, education, and the health sciences. A program of on-going orientation should include preparation for the student's return to his home country particularly at the time when he is approaching the final stages of his academic program.

2. Foreign Student Financing-- In view of increasing costs brought about by inflationary pressures and the demands being placed on traditional sources of financial aid in favor of U.S. minority students, NAFSA should take the initiative by encouraging inter-associational discussions to explore ways of meeting the impending crisis in financing the education of foreign students. Particular attention was given to the need for more concerned action in support of new legislation to ease restrictions on foreign student employment.

3. Institutional Policies Related to Foreign Student Admissions-- Throughout the meeting, the participants returned again and again to the basic issue of defining the rationale behind the admission of foreign students, particularly at the graduate level. Universities should review their "open-door" admissions policies with a view to defining their limitations so as to assure the best possible education for the foreign students who are accepted for admission. Even in those cases where institutions have statements of philosophy concerning the admission of students from abroad, it was noted that there is usually a disparity between theory and practice.

The Committee then discussed ways to develop a model statement of institutional philosophy which would be available for distribution by NAFSA to member institutions. To promote the adoption of and adherance to such a statement on the part of universities, NAFSA should (a) formulate a statement of priorities and goals in foreign student education and (b) urge that this statement be promulgated through workshops on individual campuses involving the FSA, the graduate dean, department chairmen, etc.

It was the sense of the Committee that NAFSA should begin to formulate such a statement by undertaking a study to gather information on the policies of different institutions throughout the country. One of the suggested approaches was to poll selected academic departments at some 20 institutions, asking the same questions of each department at each institution. The sample of institutions to be polled must be carefully drawn so as to reflect the differences between the large state universities and the well-established, prestigious private institutions. It was proposed that a workshop be held after the data had been collected to assess the results. What was to be done with the information and the recommendations that may ensue would be left to the discretion of CAFSS in cooperation with the other NAFSA Sections.

ACTION BY CAFSS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Crucial Issues were referred to the CAFSS Executive Committee which met in Brainerd on the following day. Of the several issues specified, CAFSS chose to undertake immediately the following two courses of action:

1. Information on foreign student employment and financial assistance would be developed. This was to be achieved initially by taking a survey of the students on nonimmigrant visas who were employed during the summer of 1970. (The "Quick Issues" survey conducted by CAFSS in the spring of 1971 will be dealt with in a later section.)

2. A Task Force on Crucial Issues was created and the following persons agreed to serve as members: Dr. Robert A. Schuiteman (Chairman), Associate Adviser to Foreign Students and Associate Director of Admissions, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Marvin J. Baron, Associate Adviser to Foreign Students and Scholars, University of California at Berkeley, and Dr. Dante Scalzi, Director of the International Student Center, Pennsylvania State University. This task force was charged with the responsibility of designing and carrying out an in-depth examination at selected institutions of departmental policies and practices in relation to the foreign graduate student. The NAFSA Field Service Program was to be approached with a proposal for funding the project. The Task Force was expected to meet within the next month to select the institutions to be surveyed and to formulate the questions to be asked.

In addition to the above-named persons, the Task Force on Crucial Issues included in its membership Dr. Mestenhauser, Chairman of CAFSS, and Mr. William N. Zimmerman, Director, Office of International Programs and Scholars at Northwestern University. Chairman Schuiteman refined their mission as follows:

> "...to gather information through intra and inter-campus surveys at selected large institutions in order to determine institutional and departmental policies and philosophies in admitting and serving foreign students."

It was hoped that in learning the variable practices of these institutions the Task Force could determine whether there is any pattern in the admission and treatment of foreign students. The Chairman noted that:

> "A number of things can result from such an endeavor: A series of papers on institutional policies and attitudes vis a vis the foreign graduate student; regional and national conference programs devoted to discussion of these topics; preparation and publication of a comprehensive NAFSA statement which universities may use as a model for establishing a policy and articulating a philosophy."

Based on support received from the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), the project was to be funded by the NAFSA Field Service Program. One phase of the project was a colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student held in June 1970 at Wingspread in Racine, Wisconsin. Addressing the participants, the Honorable John Richardson, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, made the following statement: "Apart from the educational exchanges CU sponsors, improving the quality of the experience of persons who come to America for serious scholarly purposes is seen as the area in which CU can make its greatest contribution."[3]

This statement by the Assistant Secretary reflects a long-standing interest by the Bureau in activities which serve to promote the general welfare of foreign students by encouraging the maintenance and development of new services and academic programs offered by U.S. educational institutions that are specifically designed to meet the needs of students from abroad. This interest is apparent in the continued support of the Field Service Program and the many special projects related to foreign student programming that receive funding from the Bureau.

Assured of funding and with the full support of CAFSS, the Task Force on Crucial Issues proceeded with its work by drafting the questions to be asked and by designing the survey instrument to be used. It was decided to limit the investigation to six disciplines and to 12 universities, each university being asked to report on two academic departments. The fields of study chosen were chemistry, electrical engineering, civil engineering, business administration or management, economics and educational administration. The institutions selected were well distributed geographically, and included a good balance between publically and privately supported institutions. All had graduate departments and were known to enroll more than 400 foreign students.

Using as a reference the several recommendations made by the Wingspread Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, the Task Force designed its survey to further develop and examine the following major questions:

1. Has the institution developed a statement of policy which articulates its commitment to international education and/or a statement of philosophy related to the admission of foreign students?

2. What are the primary motives that lead academic departments to admit substantial numbers of foreign students?

3. What role do finances play in foreign student admissions and what percentage of foreign students receive departmental aid?

4. What are the policies of the institution or department relative to English language proficiency at the admission stage and what is the expected level to be attained prior to graduation?

5. What specific contributions are expected of foreign students?

6. To what extent does the department feel an obligation to prepare foreign students for a professional career in their home country?

7. Are departments accepting foreign students in order to maintain quality and quantity in the departmental enrollment?

8. Do special channels exist within the department through which the foreign student can make his needs known?

9. Is there effective cooperation between the academic departments and the office of the foreign student adviser?

In February of 1971, the Task Force on Crucial Issues met in Chicago with members of the research team who represented the 12 institutions selected to participate in the study. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and to coordinate the design and method in which the survey was to be carried out. A check list of questions was devised to assist the members of the research team and were listed under six major categories:

I. Institutional Policy
II. Departmental Policy
III. Admissions
IV. Financial Aid
V. English
VI. Services and Programs

It was the goal of the Task Force that the project would develop a model for institutional self-evaluation. At the same time, it was hoped that the information collected and resulting recommendations would lead to

another Wingspread-type conference involving foreign student advisers and graduate deans.

THE REPORT

The considerable effort expended on the Crucial Issues project by the Task Force and by the research team culminated in the publication by NAFSA of An Inquiry into Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to the Graduate Education of Foreign Students. This 55-page report summarizes the findings of the research team and offers commentary by the Task Force based on findings in each of the six categories already cited:

GROUP I - INSTITUTIONAL POLICY

Findings: Of the twelve universities surveyed, six (all public) reported the existence of an institutional statement of policy or rationale in support of international education. Three of these institutions have articulated specific objectives related to educating foreign students and these statements contain phrases such as: "enriching the educational environment", "furthering the universality of the institution", "assisting other countries in development", and "helping qualified students achieve educational goals." Those institutions which lacked specific institutional guidelines felt that their commitment to the values of international educational exchange are demonstrated by their long-standing involvement in international programs and by the administrative and budgetary support given to various campus international offices in support of their activities.

Commentary: Absence of a coherent, institutional philosophy may make foreign student programs particularly vulnerable to attack by legislators, administrators, trustees and alumni who may question the presence of a large number of foreign students on the campus.

> "...institutions of higher education must make hard decisions about priorities. Unless a forward looking policy in regard to international education is considered, the danger exists that the institution, and the departments within it, may find themselves arbitrarily restricted in their international activities without the opportunity of thinking about the relevance of international education to their total educational program.[4]

GROUP II - DEPARTMENTAL POLICY

Findings: The departments surveyed had not developed written or implied policies concerning departmental involvement in international education or in the admission of foreign students. Emphasis was placed on their interest in enrolling the most qualified applicants, regardless of nationality. Most departments were not making any conscious effort to capitalize on the presence of foreign students enrolled in their programs. However, individual faculty members cited the following as what they hoped to gain from having foreign students in the department: "the addition of a different perspective to discussions and projects," "the enhancement of the international reputation of the university and the department," and "the exposure of American students to new ideas that result from a cultural mix." The departments expect the same level of performance from both foreign and U.S. students but in comparing foreign students with Americans, noted the following: foreign students are perceived by departments to be among the best and poorest of their graduate students, more successful as research assistants than as teaching assistants, more theoretical and analytical than U.S. students, and more industrious and hard-working than U.S. students.

Commentary: In general, departments show a considerable amount of good will toward foreign students and regard them favorably. However, it was noted that:

> "Foreign students bring different sets of expectations with them and it appears that departments have not paid much attention to these differences. The faculty apparently see their work as one of a universal nature; they may not be aware of the complexities of cross-cultural education and may not understand the emotionalism and dynamics of cross-cultural learning."[5]

GROUP III - ADMISSIONS

Findings: Most of the universities surveyed to not have any specific institutional or departmental policies related to the admission of graduate foreign students. Departments do not operate under any stated quotas, but some admit with self-imposed limitations in mind. Foreign students who are sponsored by government agencies or by private foundations tend to be favored over those who are self-sponsored because it is believed that they have been subject to

preliminary screening and are less likely to place any future financial burden on the department. Although a stated intention to return home upon completion of the academic program is not a factor in the admissions decision, there are indications that this may become a consideration in the future.

Commentary: Departments should note that preliminary screening by outside agencies does not necessarily mean that sponsored applicants are well selected.

It is recognized that departments may wish to restrict the enrollment of foreign students as part of a reasoned policy, but this should not be done informally as a matter of expediency. Other departments may limit the admission of foreign students because it is believed that they do not have suitable program offerings.

> "However, we would encourage expansion of international exchange opportunities whenever feasible for the department for the very reasons given by the departments when asked what they hoped to gain from the presence of foreign students. We are especially interested in education for development, in social engineering--so to speak, and certainly those departments with larger foreign student enrollments have opportunities for this kind of emphasis."[6]

GROUP IV - FINANCIAL AID

Findings: Most of the departments surveyed do not offer financial aid to first year graduate foreign students, but may make an exception for students who have earned an American Bachelor's or Master's degree. However, these same departments will consider foreign students for assistance in their second year, particularly if they are enrolled in Doctoral programs. The most common form of financial aid is the graduate assistantship. It appeared difficult for the institutions surveyed to assess accurately the seriousness of financial problems faced by foreign students, but concern was expressed about the ability of departments to maintain an adequate level of support for foreign students in view of constantly increasing costs, budgetary cutbacks, decreasing contract research funds and growing demands upon existing funds for support of U.S. minority students.

Commentary: The rising cost of higher education in the U.S. is making it increasingly difficult for foreign students to finance their studies in this country. There is evidence that we may be approaching a crisis in the funding of foreign students and it is strongly recommended that action be taken on the resolutions which were adopted by NAFSA

at its annual business meeting in Vancouver, summarized as follows:

> "...that the President of NAFSA...establish a joint task force of NAFSA members and university and college financial aid officers to explore and develop proposals that will encourage the federal government, banks, and educational institutions themselves to find new means of financing international educational exchange programs. Among the areas to be explored are federally and state guaranteed loans, tuition fee reductions, work permits, work-study programs, practical training extensions, an international education loan fund on a multi-national basis, international education teaching and research assistantships, and new kinds of flexible loan-scholarship plans, including those with 'forgiveness' features."[7]

GROUP V - ENGLISH

Findings: All but two of the departments in the study rely on scores earned on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) as the primary indicator of a foreign student's English proficiency. Most departments considered high English test scores to be a very strong factor in the admissions decision. Some faculty stated that lack of proficiency in English is the single greatest problem in the education of foreign students. However, the departments show little concern with the student's English after he has been admitted. In only a few cases do departments require or strongly encourage participation in special courses of English for foreign students even if tests indicate the need for such work.

Commentary: Although careful attention is given to maintaining high standards of English proficiency at the time of admission, many students will need and profit from additional instruction in English as a foreign language. Universities have a responsibility to develop or improve programs in English for foreign students to meet this need.

> "At the same time, it must be stated that an inflexible insistence upon a minimum score on a standardized test or other assurances that the student is fully competent in English as a condition for admission presents the real risk of refusing admission to applicants who may be in other ways exceptionally qualified. It is in order to minimize this risk that the Task Force strongly urges universities and colleges to make it possible for otherwise

gifted and acceptable students to obtain the necessary competence in English either prior to or during the initial period of enrollment through the establishment or strengthening of programs in English as a second language."[8]

GROUP VI - SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

Findings: There is evidence of effective cooperation between the academic departments surveyed and the foreign student adviser's office. However, in the case of three departments, concern was expressed by the FSA that consultation primarily occurs only when emergencies or unusual problems have reached an advanced stage of development. Departments do not provide special orientation and counseling services for their foreign students. Instead, foreign students participate in a university-wide orientation program. Although the departments do not offer academic subjects or programs specifically designed for foreign students, three programs offered at two of the universities surveyed have relevance for developing nations (two in engineering and one in economics). In only one department (educational administration) are Doctoral candidates encouraged to write their theses in absentia, in their home countries. This department and one other (economics) also encouraged students to write on topics pertinent to their home countries.

Commentary: "We believe that departments can be of far greater service in meeting the needs of foreign students and that ways in which this can be accomplished need examination. Special orientation and counseling services for the department's foreign graduate students are two examples of potential assistance that warrant consideration.

"We think that the decision a foreign student makes to try to remain in the United States or to return home is in large part influenced by efforts made by the university and the student to relate the student's program of study to the social, economic and employment conditions in his home country. His inclination will be to stay in the United States if all of his educational and training experiences are identical to those received by his U.S. counterparts. Attention to the process of adapting U.S. training to conditions in the home country is greatly needed. We would like to see departments give more attention to the connection between study here and return home in order to provide the foreign student with a realistic choice about his future."[9]

EPILOGUE TO THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE

Among the interesting, but not unexpected, by-products of the study which led to the publication on the foreign graduate student were the very positive developments which occurred at the institutions surveyed, solely as a result of the contacts and ensuing discussions which were generated by the individual members of the research team. The campus interviewers reported the following examples:

- Additional avenues of communication have been opened between the departments and the foreign student adviser.

- An awareness of the mutuality of interests and endeavors has intensified between the departments and the administration creating greater possibilities for future cooperation and sharing of responsibilities.

- A rethinking, or an initiation of thinking, has developed in the departments about their role in international education and their responsibility to the foreign graduate student. For the first time, some departments are thinking about many of the issues covered by the checklist. In turn, the foreign student adviser has learned about many departmental policies and procedures.

- The foreign student adviser's office at one participating university has written and published a brochure about international student services which is designed to explain its program to the university community.

- Participation in intercultural groups for U.S. faculty is being considered on one campus as an alternative to other faculty committee assignments.

- One university has begun to work on a policy statement on international education for consideration by its regents.[10]

As in the case of many studies of this kind, the report of the Task Force on Crucial Issues may raise as many questions as it has succeeded in answering. The publication of An Inquiry into Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to the Graduate Education of Foreign Students was considered to be the first in a series of steps designed to explore the many issues raised at the Brainerd meeting in October 1970. In part, the report has responded to the questions raised and the recommendations made at the Wingspread colloquium to which we have already referred. What is most important, the work of the Task Force has provided NAFSA and other educational associations with a document that can serve as a valuable resource for continued research and discussion of crucial issues in foreign student education.

Among the other issues and research needs cited by the report are:

1. A study of the relationship between foreign and U.S. students to discover what benefits accrue from contact with each other. Are the experiences of both enriched?

2. The kind and quality of education the foreign student receives must be examined. The student should be queried at different stages of his academic program and then again after he graduates and returns home. What is the relationship of his studies here to the career he is pursuing at home?

3. Related to these issues is the question of how the foreign student perceives the relevance of a U.S. education to his future outside the United States -- economically, socially, politically and personally. "Subjected to a host of cross-currents, how does he accommodate what he is doing and learning (and observing) as a student with what he must do afterwards as a 'third culture' person?" "How can we assist the foreign student in synthesizing the many and diverse forces which press upon him so that his total experience is significant and positive?"[11]

In addition to the three reports already cited,* the reader may wish to refer to the following publications for further background and information:

Owen, Wyn F., Academic Orientation for Foreign Graduate Students -- A Study of the Economics Institute. Institute of International Education, New York, New York, 1967.

Peisch, Mark L., The Foreign Graduate Student at Twenty-Two American Universities: Admissions and Financial Aid. Institute of International Education and the College Entrance Examination Board, New York, New York, 1965.

Guide for the Education of Foreign Students: Human Resources Development. Agency for International Development and National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C. 1974.

Human Resources Development: The Foreign Student on Campus (A Workshop Report). Agency for International Development and National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C. 1972.

Improving the Latin American Business Student's Experience in the U.S. University (A Conference Report). National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C. 1971.

International Dimensions of Education. A Statement of Policy and Proposed Action by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. The State Education Department, Albany, New York, 1970.

CRUCIAL ISSUES PROJECT EXPANDED

Following completion of the Crucial Issues survey in the winter of 1971 and in anticipation of the report's publication, it was announced at the NAFSA annual conference in Vancouver, B.C., that the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs had awarded an additional grant to NAFSA in order to expand the Crucial Issues project. At meetings of the Field Service Steering Committee held in the following year, it was determined that additional activity should take place in order to deal with the report's findings and recommendations. A number of suggestions were made as to the appropriate ways in which such a follow-up could be carried out. These included the possibility of inviting graduate deans and department chairmen from key institutions throughout the country to join in a meeting with selected NAFSAns to discuss the implications of the report and possible means of implementing the recommendations of the Task Force. In February of 1973, Dr. Mestenhauser submitted a proposal which recommended that workshops be held in various parts of the country involving academicians and members of NAFSA in order to achieve the following results:

1. Familiarize wider groups of people with the contents of the Crucial Issues publication.

2. Solicit reactions to the problems, and get specific recommendations for an outreach program of the future.

3. Identify key people on campuses, in professional societies, and other target groups, and determine the methods of such contacts.

4. Ascertain and assess the degree of support for foreign student programs.

5. Establish liaison between NAFSA and various professional societies for the purpose of examining the needs of foreign students at their national meetings and in professional journals.

In April 1973, a meeting was held at the NAFSA Office in Washington to discuss this proposal. Those participating included members of the Task Force on Crucial Issues, members of the CAFSS Executive Committee and Department of State personnel. It was agreed that any follow-up to be done on the Crucial Issues report should be carried out in close cooperation with the Council of Graduate Schools. A meeting was proposed for the month of June to actively involve members of the academic community in discussions related to the Crucial Issues report.

At the invitation of Assistant Secretary Richardson, graduate deans and other academicians from ten major universities throughout the country joined with personnel from the Department of State and U.S. AID along

with selected NAFSAns in a meeting held at the U.S. Department of State on June 13, 1973. In an opening statement of welcome to the participants, Secretary Richardson noted that this meeting was of particular importance to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. In a shrinking and increasingly interdependent world, international relationships and intercultural communication take on paramount importance. As part of this process, the interchange of graduate students between universities in different countries serves a valuable function. The international dimension thus created within the university helps to identify and produce a better understanding of both the differences and common factors which exist in the global community. Since the exchange of students between the U.S. and other countries serves to provide a channel of communication between this country and their homelands, foreign graduate students, their experiences while in the U.S. and after their return home, were of great and growing importance to the U.S. Government. Secretary Richardson emphasized that the report on Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to the Graduate Education of Foreign Students contained significant information regarding the current situation. He anticipated that this meeting, called to consider the implications of the Crucial Issues report, would provide further insights and suggest possible courses of action which would be of great interest to the Bureau.

With respect to departmental policies related to the foreign graduate student, it was generally agreed by the participants that there exist few specific formulations of such policy. However, the important point to be made is that universities do not discriminate <u>against</u> the foreign student and although some felt that they should not be singled out as a special problem, it was accepted that "foreign students do have problems and concerns that are different--some in kind, some merely in degree-- from those of American students."[12]

In exploring the attitudes of key elements within the university such as the graduate dean and department chairmen, it was concluded that academic departments seek to achieve certain goals and that the decision to admit or not to admit foreign students may be determined by the degree to which these goals can be fulfilled, as follows:

- to recruit the best available talent,
- to maintain the optimal number of students in the department,
- to fill the need for qualified research assistants (it being noted, that foreign students can be obtained at lower rates than U.S. students),
- to implement a policy that ignores national origin and relates to the world-wide community of those engaged in a particular discipline,
- to extend a particular field of study by providing a nucleus of trained talent to develop new schools or faculties in foreign countries.

The increasing cost of educating graduate students, combined with diminishing support for graduate studies, make the recommendations regarding finances in the Crucial Issues report somewhat unrealistic at this time. Both private and public sponsors find their resources insufficient to maintain the same number of students on scholarships as they did in previous years. At the same time, various avenues for securing supplemental support are closing as employment opportunities decline. From the national point of view, it was argued that if the admission of foreign graduate students is in the national interest, then federal funding should be available for this purpose. However, the magnitude of domestic priorities indicates that this will not be forthcoming. It was suggested that these same considerations explain the constraints on the use of foundation funds for the support of education of foreign graduate students. The multinational corporations, with their global need for trained manpower, should have a vested interest in the education of the foreign graduate student and support from this source might be made attractive if tax benefits could be derived. In addition to direct support, multinational corporations might be mobilized to support international education on the basis that the education of foreign students serves to strengthen the overseas economy of the U.S. and promotes the products of a particular state in which such a corporation is located.

The exhaustive and practical review of issues related to the graduate education of foreign students at the June 1973 meeting led to consideration of ways in which activities dealing with these issues might be further developed. It was agreed that the most urgent need was to engage the interest and support of a much broader section of the educational community and of the general public. The efforts of NAFSA to educate the public through the activities of its members in their home states should be encouraged. In addition, it was recommended that meetings be arranged at key points across the country to bring together those involved with institutional governance, those who are active in state legislatures and in the Congress, and those who are identified as business and community leaders. Such people should be invited to meet with internationally-minded educators and NAFSAns to explain and promote the idea of maintaining and developing the international element in contemporary graduate education. Meanwhile, individual universities should begin a process of self-examination and try to involve a wider spectrum of their own faculty in an understanding of the unique character of the foreign graduate student and his needs. The meeting concluded with the unanimous agreement that steps be taken to implement the above recommendations and those present offered to assist in the preparation and organization of such activities in their own geographical areas.

In September 1973, a meeting was held which included the Field Service Program staff and NAFSA members who had been involved in the Crucial Issues project. Once again, an attempt was made to refine the approach to be taken as a follow-up to the Crucial Issues report and the recommendations emanating from the June meeting with graduate deans. It was concluded that the Crucial Issues project should no longer be assigned to a small Task Force but instead, to appropriate NAFSA Commissions which were at that time defining their roles. A two-prong approach was recommended: (1) a series of "saturation seminars" on specified campuses to explore the crucial issues in foreign student education already identified,

continuing the project as an outreach program especially aimed at establishing meaningful cooperation with other national and international organizations; and (2) a special thrust to deal with these issues at the 1975 National Conference which is to emphasize inter-associational cooperation in international education. At the meeting of the Field Service Steering Committee in May 1974, it was reported that item (1) had not been implemented because of limitations on staff time. However, the second was being referred to the 1975 Conference Committee with the recommendation that Crucial Issues be stressed in conference programming and be related to investigations already undertaken in this area. With possible funding from the NAFSA Field Service Program, the Committee suggested the possibility of developing papers to be presented at the Conference on the various issues as defined under the project; e.g., funding, return rate, manpower needs, integration of foreign students as a resource, and relevancy of academic programs.

Although some disappointment must be expressed because lack of total success in implementing the recommendations of the Crucial Issues report, it must be recognized that the report itself was a considerable achievement and remains as a model for institutional self-study. At the same time, the many valuable discussions which have occurred at meetings and workshops since publication of the report have focused considerable attention on matters of vital concern in the education of foreign students. These, in turn, have led to other studies and projects directly related to topics under the general category of Crucial Issues. It is these studies and projects, some completed and others in progress, to which this report shall now be directed.

FOREIGN STUDENT FINANCES AND EMPLOYMENT

Earlier in this report, reference was made to the survey taken by the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars in response to one of the recommendations made in Brainerd by the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education. In the winter of 1971, CAFSS conducted a "Quick Issues" survey of 170 academic institutions to determine the financial aid and employment opportunities available to foreign students and obtain information on the cost of tuition at these institutions. A questionnaire was sent to all institutions enrolling 200 or more foreign students as reported in the IIE publication Open Doors and to other institutions having full-time foreign student advisers. A total of 98 institutions responded to the questionnaire, a return of some 58%.

The results of the survey confirmed that tuition costs for foreign students had reached a new high, with 30 institutions reporting that tuition and fees exceeded $2,000.00 per academic year. A majority of the respondents felt that the situation regarding funding foreign students and Foreign Student Advising services was approaching a crisis level. To help alleviate this situation, there was strong support for a relaxation of rules affecting foreign student employment. Again, a majority favored removal of the clause in existing regulations which states that F students seeking employment must not displace U.S. citizens. There was additional support for new legislation which would grant F-2 visa holders the same privileges as J-2 visa holders.

It would appear that most foreign student advisers responding to the questionnaire were willing to accept additional responsibilities in their work by favoring new legislation which would delegate to them the authority to grant both part-time work permission during the school year and full-time vacation employment to foreign students after they have completed their first year of study in the U.S.

Although there was general support for relaxation of part-time employment restrictions, more than half of those responding indicated that they would not favor new legislation that would extend the maximum period of practical training from 18 months to three years. However, some FSA's commented that an extension of the practical training period might make it possible in exceptional cases for students to repay long-term loans taken from the university to cover their educational expenses. Such a plan would help to assure repayment of such loans and suggests that a program of federally guaranteed loan assistance may be one of the chief ways to combat the problem of funding the education of foreign students.

Expressing opposition to restrictions placed on foreign student employment, one FSA made a very telling comment: "Probably, underlying this is an aversion to our hypocritical tribute to an American student who works his way through college, while concurrently blaspheming the foreign student who wants to do the same thing." Another FSA put it this way: "I believe employment summers and a period after graduation whether practical training or otherwise should be required before a foreign student gets any degree...not for the cash but for the learning." Employment in the U.S. offers an orientation to U.S. life not available in the classroom, "providing both cross-class and cross-cultural experiences, insight into basic American beliefs and values, and exposure to attitudes toward work, labor, management, etc."

The results of the CAFSS survey provided a clear expression of feeling on the part of NAFSAns with regard to a number of specific issues related to foreign student employment. These concerns have stimulated increased activity on the part of NAFSA to create additional lines of communication within the councils of government, first through its Committee on Government Liaison and more recently through the work of the Legislative Liaison Committee, the Commission on Representation, and the Inter-Associational Task Force on Legislation concerned with foreign students and scholars.

One of the significant steps taken in the direction of easing restrictions on the employment of foreign students is NAFSA's Position Paper on Laws and Regulations Governing International Educational Interchange. First proposed by Eugene H. Smith of the University of Colorado, the original draft was adopted by the Board of Directors at its December 1973 meeting and included the following statement:

> "The financial squeeze on foreign students in the 1970's is aggravated by tightening government regulations which inhibit the ability of students to earn any substantial part of their educational expenses.... Some of these regulations are old and outmoded, others are designed to prevent the entry of large numbers of additional persons into the labor market. Changes

are needed to increase flexibility, provide for greater work opportunities for foreign students, and reduce administrative problems. The changes which are proposed in this paper would do much to accomplish those goals while at the same time adding no significant number of persons to the labor market."

The NAFSA Position Paper expresses concern about the new financial restrictions placed on the issuance of nonimmigrant student visas by the U.S. Department of State and the increasing difficulties faced by foreign students in obtaining permission from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service to undertake part-time and vacation employment. Carried to their logical conclusion, such policies would restrict educational opportunities in the U.S. to the economic elite in foreign countries -- a phenomenon which is in complete contradiction to the generally accepted educational philosophy of most U.S. academic institutions. Although the Position Paper calls for an immediate return, as an interim measure, "to the reasonable, flexible, and humane attitudes and practices of the 1960's in the administration and enforcement of regulations governing foreign students," it also proposed "broad new legislation which will reaffirm the position of the United States with respect to international education as expressed in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act to provide for the development and growth of international educational exchange." The proposed changes in legislation include many of the recommendations supported by the NAFSA membership in the CAFSS "Quick Issues" survey of 1971. Such new legislation is deemed necessary because present regulations governing the majority of foreign students in the U.S. are designed not for international educational development but for alien control.

The need for changes in legislation affecting the study programs of foreign students became increasingly more apparent in the years 1971 and 1972 with the rapidly rising cost of higher education, the concurrent decline in financial aid opportunities for foreign students, and the strict application of regulations limiting their employment in this country. Repeated efforts on the part of NAFSA in its contacts with agencies of the U.S. Government to ease restrictions on the employment of foreign students came at a time when these same agencies were expressing mounting concern about the illegal employment of aliens in general.

The lack of precise data upon which to present a case in behalf of foreign students pointed to the need for more information concerning the visa and financial status of foreign students in so far as it affects their ability to continue their studies and relates to the conditions under which they or their spouses may lawfully undertake employment. In the winter of 1973, having been directly challenged by agency representatives to gather the facts relative to foreign student financing and employment, NAFSA submitted a proposal to the Rockefeller Foundation requesting funds in support of an in-depth study which would provide a body of information that could be used as a basis for future recommendations. Grant assistance was received from the Rockefeller Foundation and from the Agricultural Development Council, Inc. The study was undertaken in the winter of 1974 under the direction of Dr. John E. Stecklein of the University of Minnesota.

This survey was initially designed to obtain from 52 major U.S. institutions information on the employment activities and needs of foreign students, and their financial resources and needs. Included in the study plan was an additional survey of individual foreign students, which was funded by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. Of the 52 institutions contacted, 36 responded to the survey. They represent a total enrollment of approximately 39,000 foreign students. The 900 foreign students who replied to the individual survey were enrolled at seven institutions, six with large foreign student enrollments in major metropolitan areas and one located in a small city.

Entitled Study of Foreign Student Employment and Financial Resources, the report of the survey was released in December 1974. According to the summary prepared by NAFSA, an extrapolation of data collected in the survey shows that the primary support for foreign students attending U.S. institutions comes from sources outside the country and represents a contribution of $320,000,000 annually to the U.S. economy. U.S. colleges and universities provide an important second major source of support for foreign students, estimated at over $100,000,000 per academic year. A third element in their support is derived from part-time and summer employment (excluding assistantships) which provides approximately $101,000,000 in income annually.

> "Although only supplemental, (part-time and summer employment) income plays a significant role in enabling students from middle income segments of their societies to pursue a course of study at U.S. colleges and universities. Thus any restriction of this opportunity to find their own solution to the problems of rising tuition costs and inflationary costs of living would mean that students who cannot find some other financial assistance would be forced to abandon their educational program and return to their homelands, disappointed and disillusioned in their plans to complete their education in the U.S.A."[13]

Data on actual foreign student employment were provided by 29 institutions enrolling 31,830 foreign students. Slightly less than a fourth of the foreign students at these institutions were reported to be working. Of this group, most of the professional school or graduate level students held on-campus jobs with quarter-time or half-time appointments as teaching or research assistants. Of those who worked off campus, 69 percent had jobs which were not related to their fields of study. Most worked between one-fourth or one-half time in part-time jobs. An extrapolation of these figures indicates that approximately 12,000 of the 118,339 nonimmigrant students in the U.S. at that time held off-campus jobs during the 1973-74 academic year. Some 26,000 of the total had on-campus teaching assistantships.

The foreign students who responded to the individual survey represented 7.1 percent of the total foreign student population in the U.S. Of this group, 68 percent were graduate students working for advanced degrees. The primary source of support, reported by 41 percent of the respondents, was parents or relatives. On the average, they depended on these sources for 56 percent of their total income. The next most frequently cited source of support, claimed by 22 percent of the respondents, was an assistantship or fellowship from a U.S. university. Savings from summer earnings were relied upon by 20 percent of the students; 12 percent depended on off-campus jobs; and 13 percent utilized savings brought with them from their home countries. As might be expected, however, support from parents and relatives and personal savings tends to decrease after the student's first year of study in the U.S. These decreases are off-set by increased support from educational institutions and by income from part-time employment both on and off campus. The results of the individual survey confirm the findings of the institutional study which was based on information provided by foreign student advisers.

It is important to note that the Study of Foreign Student Employment and Financial Resources is the first comprehensive study of its kind. The survey report provides valuable data which can be used to determine the impact of rapidly increasing costs and employment restrictions upon the financial resources of foreign students currently attending U.S. colleges and universities. It is the hope of NAFSA that by obtaining accurate information on the financial resources and needs of foreign students constructive ways can be found to avert a crisis involving work opportunities for those students who need to augment their support.

FOREIGN STUDENT ORIENTATION

One of the issues raised at the October 1970 meeting in Brainerd was the question of foreign student orientation and the need to provide more specific orientation to students seeking professional training at the graduate level. Also, it was generally agreed that traditional programs of orientation are outmoded and that more emphasis should be given to orientation as a continuing process, with the foreign student assuming a more active role in developing program activities which are designed to meet his needs. Both the method and content of initial and on-going programs of orientation should be more sophisticated in keeping with the rising level of sophistication exhibited by foreign students. Orientation to academic disciplines should be balanced with a general orientation to U.S. culture. As the year progresses, U.S. students and representatives of the community should be invited to participate in programming related to cross-cultural communication and leadership training. The NAFSA Field Service Program was urged to undertake a revision of the NAFSA Guidelines publication on Orientation, with a view toward incorporating these suggestions.

PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION

Related to the question of the relevancy of a U.S. education to the foreign student and the needs of his home country is the task of preparing the student for re-entry into the home culture after completion

of his U.S. study experience. A number of pre-departure programs have been conducted on a regional basis since the late 60's. Examples of such programs are the "Seminar-Workshop for Returning Foreign Students" sponsored by Cornell University, the Cincinnati Rotary Club "Going Home Seminar," and the Southern Illinois University-Mohonk Trust "Pre-Departure Seminar." These seminars are not to be confused with traditional programs such as "Summer Crossroads" and the "Williamsburg International Assembly" which have been topical in nature.

In October 1974, a workshop on re-entry/transition programs was convened by the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities in cooperation with the NAFSA/AID Liaison Committee and the Johnson Foundation at the Foundation's conference center in Wingspread, Wisconsin. The workshop was attended by foreign student advisers, academicians, and foreign students from more than 25 academic institutions, as well as representatives from approximately 10 government and private agencies involved in international educational exchange. The colloquium had as its stated purpose the development of "guidelines and recommendations for ways to assist foreign students in the United States to return and fulfill needed roles in their countries of origin."[14]

At the Tenth Mohonk Consultation with International Students held in New Paltz, New York, in January 1973, the following rationale was developed as a basis for pre-departure programs:

> Since students educated in countries other than their home country face special adjustment problems upon returning home, "pre-departure seminars should be convened in the host countries with the objective of preparing students for their return home. These seminars should highlight the problems students may encounter and offer possible solutions. They should emphasize ways in which the returnee may most effectively contribute to the well-being of his or her country. These seminars would also help the foreign student adapt to the changing socio-economic and political situation back home.
>
> "A further objective would be to serve as channels of communication for consultant resource sharing and feedback to be used by individuals on campus, by organizations, governments and international agencies, now and in the future.
>
> "In order to help the student make a successful re-entry adjustment at home, pre-departure seminars should be part of an on-going program including pre-entry, post-entry and mid-stay experiences conducted in the host country."[15]

Among the several objectives of such programs as those conducted at Cornell and by the Cincinnati Rotary Club are the following:

- to evaluate the U.S. experience in order to gain insight and to reach conclusions as to what this experience means in the future,
- to discuss the adaptability of learned patterns or techniques and of new cultural values to the situation at home,
- to assist in clarifying the foreign student's understanding of American society and culture,
- to explore the principles and methods of initiating change in the home society and in the foreign student's profession,
- to assess the adaptability of the educational training received in the U.S. to the needs of the home country, particularly in terms of job placement and the students' ultimate career goals.

One of the achievements of the Wingspread colloquium on Re-Entry/Transition Seminars was the identification of specific problems which foreign students may encounter after they return home. The list of problem areas which appears in the workshop report is based on an inventory compiled by a group of Department of State grantees at a workshop held in the summer of 1973. The inventory had been amplified and was presented to the colloquium by one of the Wingspread participants. It is broken down into six major headings: (1) Cultural Adjustment, (2) Social Adjustment, (3) Linguistic Barriers, (4) National and Political Problems, (5) Educational Problems, and (6) Professional Problems. Under these headings, specific concerns were identified, ranging in number from six in one category to as many as sixteen in another. This inventory is useful as a basis for continued study of re-entry/transition problem areas and may even serve as a basic format for a workshop program.

Those attending the colloquium at Wingspread almost unanimously agreed that preparation for return to the home country should not begin just as the student is approaching the termination of his studies, but should be a continuous process that is initiated in the early stages of his U.S. experience. In a sense, the on-going orientation of foreign students recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee at Brainerd should be complemented by a balanced program which not only provides the basic tools needed to function in the U.S. environment but, at the same time, prepares the foreign student for re-entry into his home culture and society. The process of preparation for the return home requires that attention be given to at least two areas involving the foreign student's U.S. experience. The first, outside his academic program, is to ensure maximum contact with his home country through such channels as the student's consulate or embassy and by keeping current on developments in the home country. These may "serve the dual purposes of maintaining a sense of reality about the student's role upon his return and serving as a culture link for values which may be lost too easily in the process of so-called adjustment to U.S. society."[16]

The second area of special concern is the relevance of the U.S. academic program to the role that the foreign student is expected to fulfill when he returns home. "To the extent that faculty advisers or individual professors can gear aspects of course work or perhaps thesis topics or research projects to the anticipated vocational role, the student may begin here to prepare for his responsibilities."[17] Paraphrasing one of the major recommendations of the Crucial Issues report, the Wingspread conferees stated that the "academic adviser, foreign student adviser, or both, must help the student extract principles of utility from the educational experience" or in the words of one participant, "to transform knowledge into transmittable skills."[18]

The following recommendations are among those which appear at the end of the Wingspread colloquium report, funded by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State.

1. That a workshop be conducted involving those who have had pre-departure seminar experiences to develop a model for re-entry/transition seminars of varying lengths.

2. That a national clearinghouse be established for sharing information on current and proposed programs, including some assessment of their impact and innovative program ideas.

3. That information on re-entry/transition seminars be included as part of the NAFSA Field Service Consultant's Manual. (Expertise in this area could also be developed among NAFSA "Generalist" Consultants.)

4. That funding be provided through the NAFSA Field Service Program to support in-service training grants and workshops related to the topic of re-entry/transition seminars.

5. That professional organizations be encouraged to establish re-entry/transition programs which would serve the needs of foreign students in specific or related disciplines.

6. That contacts be developed among overseas alumni to assist program planners in learning first-hand the particular needs of returning foreign students.

7. That a series of case studies be accumulated to document the problems of returning foreign students for use in seminar programs.

8. That the topic of re-entry/transition seminars be incorporated into NAFSA regional and national conference programs.

HOME COUNTRY EMPLOYMENT

One of the concerns raised at the Brainerd meeting in October 1970 was the need to assist foreign students in their efforts to locate a job in the home country. The Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education proposed that steps be taken to assess manpower needs in the developing countries and to learn what specific areas of expertise are in demand in each country. When this has been accomplished, NAFSA should initiate discussions with the National Placement Council in an effort to share this information with placement officers at the local and national levels.

It must be noted that NAFSA and its Committee on Latin American Students had already established contacts with prospective employers of foreign students through the NAFSA Corporate Liaison Committee. In the academic year 1972-73, the Chairman of the Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars contacted representatives of several multinational corporations to explore ways in which NAFSA could assist them in publicizing job opportunities overseas. At the 1973 NAFSA annual conference in Detroit, CAFSS sponsored a program on "Overseas Employment Opportunities for Foreign Students." The topic was presented by a panel which included representatives from three major U.S. corporations which have foreign subsidiaries. The interest generated by this program led to increased activity on the part of NAFSA to establish an effective means whereby foreign students can be assisted with job placement in their home countries. Among the projects undertaken were the development of a resume handbook under the direction of the Committee on Latin American Students, a pilot project and workshop at Louisiana State University for Career Development Opportunities for U.S. Trained International Students, and a Foreign National Employment Survey conducted by the General Electric Co. At the NAFSA annual conference in Albuquerque, these efforts were consolidated under a single Task Force on Home Country Employment. Task Force members include representatives from academic institutions, educational associations, and industry.

The Task Force on Home Country Employment held its first meeting in July 1974. Its immediate objective was to provide opportunities for foreign students who are about to complete their academic programs to make contact with prospective employers. To this end, the Task Force established the Home Country Employment Registry as a clearinghouse for matching the qualifications of graduating foreign students with the needs of potential employers. The Registry began operation in the fall of 1974 with Erin L. Schmidt of Louisiana State University as Project Coordinator.

Based on a progress report submitted to NAFSA in March 1975, it is apparent that the Home Country Employment Registry has made significant progress in meeting the needs of both graduating foreign students and prospective employers. After only seven months of operation, it was reported that more than 240 academic institutions are participating in the project and that bio-cards on approximately 3,800 foreign students have been collected. At least 90 companies, including large multinational

corporations, are taking advantage of the service. Inquiries from those companies have resulted in the mailing of more than 6,500 foreign student cards to prospective employers. Efforts are now being made to increase the number of participating companies and to further publicize the value of the service to educational institutions and to foreign students.

The success of this project indicates that it can be established as a permanent service. The response on the part of interested companies further suggests that the Registry can become self-sustaining based on income received from the collection of fees for use of the service--a fee which many companies have indicated they would be willing to pay. The Registry recognizes its obligation to send only pertinent information to inquiring employers and that every effort must be made to maintain a high standard of quality and accuracy when referring applicants to them.

By providing this new service, the Home Country Employment Registry partially fulfills one of the stated purposes of NAFSA which is "to assist educational institutions in the development of effective programs in the field of international education" and "to provide information in meeting the needs of international students." The original proposal for funding this project submitted by the Task Force on Home Country Employment included the following statement:

> "The Home Country Employment Projects relate to why the student comes to the United States in the first place, i.e., to develop his career potential. Early exposure to the Home Country Employment Program may enable a student to think critically about his career plans and perhaps adjust the direction of his academic program as he moves through his college or university years. If a student knows what career possibilities exist or may be developed in his home country, and if realistic communication links between students and potential employers can be established early in the student's academic program, we will definitely be aiding in the career development process."

CONSLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Notable progress has been made, however, in a number of areas identified by the Task Force on Crucial Issues including gathering essential data and implementing proposals related to orientation, the role of academic departments, funding and employment, and cooperative efforts with other educational associations. The latter has been partially accomplished by the recent establishment of the Inter-Associational Task Force on Legislation Concerned with Foreign Students and Scholars which, in addition to NAFSA, includes the following educational or professional associations:

- American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- American Council on Education (International Education Project)
- Association of American Universities
- College Entrance Examination Board
- Institute of International Education
- National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

One significant advance in legislation affecting foreign students at the state level took place in Minnesota with passage of a bill by the State legislature providing (1) waiver of the non-resident portion of tuition fees to foreign students not to exceed one-half of one percent of the total student enrollment; (2) a grant of $80,000 for emergency scholarship aid to foreign students in public and private post-secondary institutions; and (3) waiver of non-resident tuition fees to foreign students who receive scholarship aid from individuals or corporations within the State. The bill stipulates that the benefits derived would be given to foreign students as loan assistance which would be forgiven if the grantees returned to their home countries for at least five years. (See Fall 1974 issue of Exchange magazine.) The achievement represented by this bill is an example of what can be accomplished through concerted action on the part of NAFSAns with support from the community, and in cooperation with key business and political leaders. The legislation enacted in Minnesota is a direct response to the funding crisis now being experienced by many of our foreign students.

Although it is appropriate to emphasize the progress that has been made in the many areas related to the Crucial Issues Project, there is at least one topic which demands immediate and continuing attention, i.e., further development and implementation of the recommendations made as a follow-up to the publication of An Inquiry into Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to the Graduate Education of Foreign Students. This report of the Task Force on Crucial Issues and subsequent meetings related to the report's findings strongly suggest that NAFSA must take the initiative in broadening its contacts with the academic community through key faculty on individual campuses and through their professional associations on the national level. Rather than focusing attention on graduate deans, as has been done, new efforts should perhaps concentrate more heavily on the heads of academic departments. Because of their pivotal positions and direct involvement with foreign students and their studies, the assistance and cooperation of department chairmen may be the key to future activities and progress. A major effort is needed to encourage foreign student advisers to conduct an internal evaluation of their own programs using as a model for self-study the survey instrument and techniques devised by the Task Force on Crucial Issues for the report on the foreign graduate student. The channels of communication that can be opened by such self-studies would be beneficial to all concerned.

New attempts must be made by NAFSA and its appropriate Commissions to revive an earlier proposal which recommended that workshops be held on a regional basis involving experienced members of NAFSA, graduate deans, and department chairmen, to discuss the implications of the Crucial Issues report. When preparing for these workshops, all participating institutions should be given a period of time within which they should be encouraged to complete the self-study recommended above. Second, NAFSA should develop a model statement of institutional philosophy which clearly sets forth the goals to be achieved, either perceived or implied, in educating foreign students. The actual planning of the workshops should be accomplished as a joint effort with the Council of Graduate Schools and with other educational and professional associations. Coordination of activities with these organizations will create new and continuing opportunities for dialogue on major issues related to the broad spectrum of international education and the education of foreign students in particular. The workshops themselves should deal specifically with the Crucial Issues report and the issues raised at the meeting with graduate deans in June 1973.

In conclusion, the NAFSA Crucial Issues Project has stimulated considerable activity in areas related to the development of new programs and improved services to foreign students who are enrolled at U.S. academic institutions. This is evident from the many projects which have been initiated and are currently under way. The issues raised point to a continuing need for further development, research and action to deal with such major concerns as foreign student employment and finances, programs of on-going orientation to the U.S. and pre-departure orientation, the relevancy of academic programs, and job placement in the home country. In response to these issues, the Commissions and professional interest sections of NAFSA are challenged to accept the following tasks:

1. Continue to work for basic changes in legislation and the interpretation of government regulations which have a bearing on the educational programs of foreign students;

2. Seek and develop new contacts with labor and industry to foster support for expanded employment opportunities which would be of benefit to foreign students;

3. Develop new approaches to the orientation of foreign students which will integrate programs of orientation to the U.S. and preparation for return to the home country;

4. Take action on the recommendations made in the follow-up to the Crucial Issues report on the foreign graduate student;

5. Continue on a permanent basis the Home Country Employment Registry and devise ways to link this activity to the services provided by college and university placement offices;

6. Establish closer inter-associational contact with other national educational organizations and professional societies to create opportunities for dialogue on issues related to the educational and professional training of foreign students in the U.S.

-30-

The implementation of these recommendations will assure the continued development of the vigorous activity already undertaken by NAFSA in responding to the needs and concerns raised by the identification of Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Professional School and World Affairs. Education and World Affairs, The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque (1967), p. 133.

2. Ibid., p. 280.

3. The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action. Report of a Colloquium Sponsored by the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions. College Entrance Examination Board. New York (1971), p. 47.

4. An Inquiry Into Departmental Policies and Practices In Relation to the Graduate Education of Foreign Students. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Washington, D.C. (1972), pp. 3-4.

5. Ibid., p. 9.

6. Ibid., p. 16.

7. Ibid., p. 21.

8. Ibid., p. 25.

9. Ibid., p. 31-32.

10. Ibid., p. 34.

11. Ibid., pp. 40-41.

*(1) An Inquiry into Departmental Policies and Practices in Relation to the Foreign Graduate Student.
(2) The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action.
(3) The Professional School and World Affairs.

12. The College, the University, and the Foreign Student. Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities, New York, N.Y., 1963.

13. Press Release of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C., December 11, 1974.

14. Marsh, Dr. Harriet L., Re-Entry/Transition Seminars-Report on the Wingspread Colloquium. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1975.

15. Report on Tenth Mohonk Consultation with International Students, January 3-12, 1973. The Mohonk Trust, Mohonk Lake, New Paltz, New York.

16. Re-Entry/Transition Seminars-Report on the Wingspread Colloquium, p. 6.

17. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

18. Ibid., p. 7.